

2001 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN

DRAFT
ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT REPORT

STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NO. 2001032141

DATE OF RELEASE AUGUST 10, 2001

Prepared for

Metropolitan Transportation Commission

by

DYETT & BHATIA
Urban and Regional Planners

In association with

Environmental Science Associates • Environmental Consultants
Donaldson Associates • Environmental and Planning Consultants

AUGUST 2001

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

PART ONE – INTRODUCTION AND STUDY APPROACH

1.1 Introduction and Study Approach

Introduction	1-1
Approach to the Study	1-5

1.2 Overview of the Proposed 2001 Regional Transportation Plan

Purpose and Objectives.....	1-11
Project Background.....	1-11
Project Description	1-16

PART TWO - SETTINGS, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

2.1 Transportation

Setting	2-1
Policy and Regulation	2-6
Criteria of Significance.....	2-8
Method of Analysis	2-9
Summary of Impacts.....	2-10
Significant Impacts and Mitigation Measures.....	2-14

2.2 Air Quality

Setting	2-15
Policy Requirements	2-20
Criteria of Significance.....	2-27
Method of Analysis	2-28
Summary of Impacts.....	2-29
Significant Impacts and Mitigation Measures.....	2-30

2.3 Energy

Setting	2-33
Criteria of Significance.....	2-36
Method of Analysis	2-37
Summary of Impacts.....	2-37
Significant Impacts and Mitigation Measures.....	2-38

2.4 Geology and Seismicity

Setting	2-39
Policy and Regulation	2-50

Table of Contents

	Criteria of Significance.....	2-52
	Method of Analysis	2-52
	Summary of Impacts.....	2-52
	Significant Impacts and Mitigation Measures.....	2-58
2.5	Biological Resources	
	Setting	2-61
	Policy and Regulation	2-73
	Criteria of Significance.....	2-74
	Method of Analysis	2-74
	Summary of Impacts.....	2-75
	Significant Impacts and Mitigation Measures.....	2-76
2.6	Water Resources	
	Setting	2-83
	Policy and Regulation	2-85
	Criteria of Significance.....	2-94
	Method of Analysis	2-94
	Summary of Impacts.....	2-95
	Significant Impacts and Mitigation Measures.....	2-99
2.7	Visual Resources	
	Setting	2-103
	Policy and Regulation	2-105
	Criteria Of Significance.....	2-108
	Method of Analysis	2-108
	Summary of Impacts.....	2-109
	Significant Impacts and Mitigation Measures.....	2-112
2.8	Noise	
	Setting	2-115
	Policy and Regulation	2-123
	Criteria of Significance.....	2-126
	Method of Analysis	2-127
	Summary of Impacts.....	2-128
	Significant Impacts and Mitigation Measures.....	2-131
2.9	Cultural Resources	
	Setting	2-135
	Criteria of Significance.....	2-140
	Method of Analysis	2-141
	Summary of Impacts.....	2-141
	Significant Impacts and Mitigation Measures.....	2-144
2.10	Population, Housing, and Social Environment	
	Setting	2-147
	Criteria of Significance.....	2-156

Table of Contents

Method of Analysis	2-156
Summary of Impacts.....	2-157
Significant Impacts and Mitigation Measures.....	2-162
2.11 Land Use	
Setting	2-165
Criteria of Significance.....	2-171
Method of Analysis	2-171
Summary of Impacts.....	2-172
Significant Impacts and Mitigation Measures.....	2-175
 PART THREE – ALTERNATIVES AND CEQA-REQUIRED CONCLUSIONS	
3.1 Alternatives to the Project	
Alternatives Analyzed in this EIR.....	3-1
Comparative Impact Analysis	3-3
Environmentally Superior Alternative.....	3-14
3.2 CEQA Required Conclusions	
Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes.....	3-15
Growth Inducing Impacts	3-15
Cumulative Impacts.....	3-17
3.3 Report Authors	3-19
 PART FOUR – APPENDICES	
APPENDIX A: NOTICE OF PREPARATION (NOP)	
APPENDIX B: SUMMARY OF NOTICE OF PREPARATION (NOP) COMMENTS	
APPENDIX C: PROJECT LISTINGS FOR THE 2001 RTP AND ALTERNATIVES	
APPENDIX D: BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES SUMMARY	

Table of Contents

List of Tables

1.2 Overview of the Proposed 2001 Regional Transportation Plan

Table 1.2-1: Committed and Track 1 Projects in the Golden Gate Corridor	1-22
Table 1.2-2: Committed and Track 1 Projects in the North Bay East-West Corridor.....	1-24
Table 1.2-3: Committed and Track 1 Projects in the Napa Valley.....	1-26
Table 1.2-4: Committed and Track 1 Projects in the Eastshore-North Corridor	1-28
Table 1.2-5: Committed and Track 1 Projects in the Delta Corridor	1-30
Table 1.2-6: Committed and Track 1 Projects in the Diablo Corridor.....	1-32
Table 1.2-7: Committed and Track 1 Projects in the Tri-Valley Corridor	1-34
Table 1.2-8: Committed and Track 1 Projects in the Sunol Gateway Corridor	1-36
Table 1.2-9: Committed and Track 1 Projects in the Eastshore-South Corridor.....	1-38
Table 1.2-10: Committed and Track 1 Projects in the Fremont-South Bay Corridor.....	1-40
Table 1.2-11: Committed and Track 1 Projects in Silicon Valley.....	1-42
Table 1.2-12: Committed and Track 1 Projects in the Peninsula Corridor.....	1-44
Table 1.2-13: Committed and Track 1 Projects in San Francisco	1-46
Table 1.2-14: Committed and Track 1 Projects in the Transbay Corridors	1-48
Table 1.2-15: Committed and Track 1 Projects in the Interregional Gateways	1-50

2.1 Transportation

Table 2.1-1: Growth in Regional Population/Employment and Trips (2000 and 2025)	2-2
Table 2.1-2: Average Commute Distance Projected in the Year 2025	2-3
Table 2.1-3: Projected Person Trips Between Counties in the Year 2025 (Thousands of Trips and Percent Change from 2000)	2-3
Table 2.1-4: Growth in Person Trips by Corridor (1998 to 2025)	2-4
Table 2.1-5: Roadway Lane Miles and Transit Supply (1998 to 2025).....	2-5
Table 2.1-6: Projected Changes in Travel Behavior (1998 to 2025).....	2-6
Table 2.1-7: Average Travel Time Per Trip (1998 to 2025, in minutes)	2-10
Table 2.1-8: Accessibility to Jobs Opportunities (1998 to 2025).....	2-11
Table 2.1-9: Daily Vehicle Trips by Corridor (1998 to 2025).....	2-12
Table 2.1-10: AM Peak Period Regional VMT by Facility Type and Volume to Capacity (V/C) Ratio (1998 to 2025)	2-13

2.2 Air Quality

Table 2.2-1: Days Exceeding the 1-Hour National Ozone Standard (1990-2000)...	2-18
Table 2.2-2: Transportation Control Measures (TCMs) in the State Implementation Plan	2-22
Table 2.2-3: Proposed Transportation Control Measures in 2001 State Implementation Plan	2-23
Table 2.2-4: Transportation Control Measures in the Clean Air Plan.....	2-25
Table 2.2-5: Ambient Air Quality Standards for Criteria Pollutants	2-26
Table 2.2-6: Travel Data.....	2-29
Table 2.2-7: Emission Estimates for the 2001 RTP (Option A and Option B).....	2-29
Table 2.2-8: Emission estimates using EMFAC 7G Factors.....	2-30

2.3 Energy

Table 2.3-1: Transportation Energy Consumption in California and the Bay Area (2000)	2-34
Table 2.3-2: Energy Factors of Transit Service	2-35
Table 2.3-3: Energy Factors for Commercial Vehicle	2-35
Table 2.3-4: Daily Energy Use on Transportation Systems (BTUs in billions)	2-37
Table 2.3-5: Carbon Dioxide and Energy (BTUs in Billions) (1998 to 2025)	2-38

2.4 Geology and Seismicity

Table 2.4-1: Active Faults In The MTC Project Area	2-42
Table 2.4-2: Modified Mercalli Intensity Scale.....	2-45
Table 2.4-3: 2001 RTP Projects Likely to Experience Fault Rupture	2-54
Table 2.4-4: 2001 RTP Projects Likely to Experience Intense Ground Shaking.....	2-54
Table 2.4-5: 2001 RTP Projects Subject to Liquefaction.....	2-56

2.5 Biological Resources

Table 2.5-1: Major Rivers and Creeks in the Bay Area	2-70
--	------

2.6 Water Resources

Table 2.6-1: Monthly Average Precipitation from Selected Areas Within the Bay Area (inches)	2-84
Table 2.6-2: Known Toxic Hot Spots.....	2-89
Table 2.6-3: 2001 RTP Projects with Potentially Significant Impacts on Water Resources	2-96

2.7 Visual Resources

Table 2.7-1: 2001 RTP Projects with Potentially Significant Visual Impacts	2-110
--	-------

2.8 Noise

Table 2.8-1: Reference Noise Levels for Various Rail Operations	2-120
Table 2.8-2: Typical Construction Phase Noise Levels	2-121
Table 2.8-3: Typical Noise Levels from Construction Equipment.....	2-122
Table 2.8-4 Noise Impact Criteria: Effect on Cumulative Noise Exposure	2-126
Table 2.8-5: Growth in Vehicle Trips by RTP Corridor (1998 to 2025, millions of trips per day)	2-127
Table 2.8-6: 2001 RTP Projects With Potential Noise Impacts.....	2-128

2.9 Cultural Resources

Table 2.9-1: Recorded Archaeological and Historical Sites in the Bay Area.....	2-139
Table 2.9-2: 2001 RTP Projects with Potentially Significant Impacts on Cultural Resources.....	2-142

2.10 Population, Housing, and Social Environment

Table 2.10-1: Population Growth in the Bay Area (1980-2025).....	2-148
Table 2.10-2: Job Growth in the Bay Area (1980-2025).....	2-148
Table 2.10-3: Top Ten Bay Area Cities by Population Growth (2000-2025)	2-149
Table 2.10-4: Top Ten Bay Area Cities by Employment Growth (2000-2025)	2-149
Table 2.10-5: Age Distribution in the Bay Area.....	2-150
Table 2.10-6: Population and Employment by Bay Area County – Net Importers/Exporters of Workers (Year 2000 and 2025)	2-151
Table 2.10-7: Current and Projected Jobs/Housing Balance by MTC Superdistrict	2-153
Table 2.10-8: Current and Projected Jobs/Housing Balance by County	2-154
Table 2.10-9: 2001 RTP Projects with Potential to Displace Existing Land Uses and Disrupt Communities	2-159

2.11 Land Use

Table 2.11-1: Density of Development in the Bay Area by MTC Superdistrict.....	2-168
Table 2.11-2: Density of Development in the Bay Area by County	2-169
Table 2.11-3: Bay Area Land Use Characteristics.....	2-170
Table 2.11-4: 2001 RTP Projects with Potential to Convert Resource Land	2-173

3.1 Alternatives to the Project

Table 3.1-1: Roadway Lane Miles and Transit Supply (1998 to 2025).....	3-2
Table 3.1-2: Average Travel Time Per Trip in Minutes ¹ (1998 to 2025)	3-4
Table 3.1-3: Accessibility to Jobs (1998 to 2025).....	3-4
Table 3.1-4: Daily Vehicle Trips by Corridor (1998 to 2025).....	3-5

List of Tables

Table 3.1-5: AM Peak Period Regional VMT by Facility Type and Volume to Capacity (V/C) Ratio (1998 to 2025)	3-6
Table 3.1-6: Average Daily Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and Emission Estimates using EMFAC 7G Factors (tons/day) (1998 to 2025)	3-7
Table 3.1-7: Transportation and Circulation Impacts - Alternative Comparison	3-8
Table 3.1-8: Comparison of Alternatives to the 2001 RTP	3-14

List of Figures

1.2 Overview of the Proposed 2001 Regional Transportation Plan

Figure 1.2-1: Regional Setting	1-12
Figure 1.2-2: Population Growth by County (2000-2025)	1-14
Figure 1.2-3: Employment Growth by County (2000-2025)	1-14
Figure 1.2-4: Projected 25-Year Revenue Sources.....	1-17
Figure 1.2-5: Total 25-Year Investment Program	1-17
Figure 1.2-6: Track 1 Funds Expenditures.....	1-18
Figure 1.2-7: 2001 RTP Investment Corridors	1-20
Figure 1.2-8: Golden Gate Corridor.....	1-23
Figure 1.2-9: North Bay East-West Corridor.....	1-25
Figure 1.2-10: Napa Valley Corridor.....	1-27
Figure 1.2-11: Eastshore-North Corridor.....	1-29
Figure 1.2-12: Delta Corridor.....	1-31
Figure 1.2-13: Diablo Corridor	1-33
Figure 1.2-14: Tri-Valley Corridor.....	1-35
Figure 1.2-15: Sunol Gateway Corridor.....	1-37
Figure 1.2-16: Eastshore-South Corridor	1-39
Figure 1.2-17: Fremont-South Bay Corridor.....	1-41
Figure 1.2-18: Silicon Valley.....	1-43
Figure 1.2-19: Peninsula Corridor	1-45
Figure 1.2-20: San Francisco.....	1-47
Figure 1.2-21: Transbay Corridors.....	1-49
Figure 1.2-22: Interregional Gateways	1-51

2.2 Air Quality

Figure 2.2-1: Bay Area Air Quality Management District Boundaries.....	2-21
--	------

2.4 Geology and Seismicity

Figure 2.4-1: Principal Geologic Faults in the Bay Area	2-43
Figure 2.4-2: Areas Susceptible to Liquefaction in the Bay Area	2-48
Figure 2.4-3: Areas Susceptible to Landslides in the Bay Area	2-49

2.5 Biological Resources

Figure 2.5-1: Critical Habitat for the Alameda Whipsnake 2-64

Figure 2.5-2: Critical Habitat for the California Red-Legged Frog
(Northern Portion) 2-67

2.6 Water Resources

Figure 2.6-1: Average Monthly Rainfall for Selected Areas 2-84

Figure 2.6-2: Major Rivers, Creeks, and Other Water Bodies 2-87

Figure 2.6-3: Impaired Water Bodies..... 2-88

Figure 2.6-4: Flood Hazard Area 2-93

2.7 Visual Resources

Figure 2.7-1: State Designated and Eligible Scenic Highways 2-107

2.8 Noise

Figure 2.8-1: Effects of Noise on People 2-116

Figure 2.8-2: Recommended Guidelines for Environmental Noise Criteria
for Compatible Land Use 2-125

2.10 Population, Housing, and Social Environment

Figure 2.10-1: Disadvantaged Communities in the Bay Area..... 2-155

2.11 Land Use

Figure 2.11-1: Urbanized Land in the Bay Area 2-167

Executive Summary

The proposed 2001 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) represents the transportation policy and action statement of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) for how to approach the region's transportation needs over the next 25 years. The 2001 RTP proposes a set of future transportation projects and programs that can be implemented with available funding as well as identifying projects that could be considered if new funding is obtained. The 2001 RTP is intended to serve the region's mobility needs while addressing other important societal goals. The six main goals of the proposed 2001 RTP are:

- Improve mobility for persons and freight;
- Promote safety for system users;
- Promote equity for system users;
- Enhance sensitivity to the environment;
- Support the region's economic vitality; and,
- Support community vitality in the region.

MTC recognizes that transportation decisions have a role in influencing the economic and community vitality of the Bay Area. The proposed 2001 RTP represents MTC's best effort to guide the region in the development of a transportation system that meets the Bay Area's mobility needs while addressing other important societal goals. The proposed 2001 RTP addresses the Bay Area's ground transportation system. Development of regional airport and seaport plans occur in separate processes.

INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE OF THE EIR

This environmental assessment of the proposed 2001 RTP—which may be referred to as “the RTP Project,” or “the Project,” throughout this document—fulfills the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and is designed to inform decision-makers, responsible and trustee agencies, and the general public of the proposed 2001 RTP and the range of potential environmental impacts that could result from its implementation. This EIR recommends a set of measures to mitigate any significant adverse regional impacts identified. It also analyzes alternatives to the proposed 2001 RTP.

SCOPE OF THE EIR

This EIR on the proposed 2001 RTP is a *program EIR* as defined in the CEQA Guidelines. Program EIRs can be used as the basic, general environmental assessment for an overall program of projects which will be implemented through a series or group of later actions. While these later

actions are not evaluated in this program EIR, individual projects will be evaluated in compliance with CEQA prior to project approval.

2001 RTP EIR ORGANIZATION

This EIR document is organized into four parts, as outlined below. This executive summary which includes a review of the potentially significant adverse regional environmental impacts of the proposed 2001 RTP and the measures recommended to mitigate those impacts. This executive summary also notes whether those measures mitigate the significant impacts to a level of insignificance. Finally, the executive summary describes the alternatives, their merits compared to the 2001 RTP, and dismisses the environmentally superior alternative.

Part One: Introduction and Project Description

Part One includes two chapters. Chapter 1 describes the relationship between the proposed 2001 RTP and the EIR and describes the basic legal requirements of a program level EIR. It discusses the level of analysis and the alternatives considered as well as how this EIR is related to other environmental documents and its intended uses. Chapter 2 introduces the purpose and objectives of the 2001 RTP and summarizes specific information that will be used to describe the 2001 RTP and complete the EIR analysis. This includes a discussion of the existing project setting and an outline the Bay Area's projected population and employment growth rates and development patterns through the planning horizon to the year 2025. In addition, State and Federal legislation that guides the development of the RTP process is reviewed. Finally, this chapter introduces the proposed 2001 RTP and four project alternatives.

Part Two: Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures

Part Two describes the existing environmental setting for each of the environmental impact areas analyzed in the EIR, the potential impacts that the proposed 2001 RTP would have on these areas, and measures to mitigate the potential impacts identified. Each impact area is analyzed in a separate chapter. Each chapter is organized as follows:

- Environmental setting;
- Criteria of significance;
- Methods of analysis;
- Summary of impacts (direct and indirect/cumulative); and
- Significant impacts and mitigation measures (direct and indirect/cumulative).

Part Three: Alternatives and CEQA Required Conclusions

Part Three includes a description of four transportation alternatives to the proposed 2001 RTP and an assessment of their potential to achieve the objectives of the 2001 RTP while reducing potentially significant adverse regional environmental impacts. Part Three also includes a comparison and summary of any potentially significant adverse regional environmental impacts

that implementation of the alternatives would have for each of the environmental impact areas. As required by CEQA, an environmentally superior alternative is identified. Finally, Part Three includes an assessment of the impacts of the proposed 2001 RTP in several subjects areas required by CEQA, including:

- Significant irreversible environmental changes;
- Growth-inducing impacts; and
- Cumulative impacts.

Part Four: Appendices

Part Four includes the EIR appendices. Appendix A includes the Notice of Preparation (NOP) of this EIR and Appendix B includes copies of the letters received on the NOP. Appendix C includes detailed project lists for the proposed 2001 RTP and the four alternatives studied here. Finally, Appendix D includes a detailed discussion of the regulatory setting associated with biological resources and a detailed list of special-status species in the Bay Area with the potential to occur in or near the transportation improvements proposed in the 2001 RTP. A more detailed descriptions of additional significant ecosystems in the Bay Area that are not outlined in Part Two are also included.

APPROACH TO THE STUDY

ALTERNATIVES

This EIR evaluates the impacts of the proposed 2001 RTP and four transportation alternatives. A summary of the 2001 RTP is included in Chapter 1.2 and a full description of the four alternatives is in Chapter 3.1. The alternatives are as follows:

- **No Project Alternative** – This includes transit, local roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian projects that are in advanced planning stages and slated to go forward since they have full funding commitments. These projects are identified in the federally required Fiscal Year 2001 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and include fully funded sales tax projects authorized by voters in five Bay Areas counties, including sales tax reauthorizations in Alameda and Santa Clara Counties from the November 2000 election.
- **System Management Alternative** – This alternative includes a set of projects intended to address existing corridor mobility issues. It emphasizes the application of available funds in ways that would improve the operational efficiency of the existing transportation system, such as more express bus service, reversible carpool lanes, and a better connected HOV and transit system. This alternative provides more funding for street and road pavement maintenance shortfalls. Freeway ramp metering is assumed for the most congested corridors. Congestion pricing is assumed on the Bay bridges to generate additional revenues, including transit operating revenues, and some highway projects are deferred to provide additional capital funding.

- **Blueprint 1 Alternative** – This alternative includes the 2001 RTP projects plus projects considered in MTC's 2000 *Bay Area Transportation Blueprint for the 21st Century* that could be funded if certain new revenue sources are developed. These revenue sources are considered reasonable in that they represent extensions of or increases to existing funding sources, or have legislative authorization to be developed or implemented. Potential sources of new revenue include a regional gas tax of up to 10-cents, higher bridge tolls, new and extended sales taxes in various counties, BART bonds, and continuation of higher state transportation funding levels as recently provided in the Governor's 2000 *Transportation Congestion Relief Program (TCRP)*, and passed by the State Legislature as a proposed constitutional amendment on the March 2002 ballot.
- **Blueprint 2 Alternative** – This alternative includes the Blueprint 1 Alternative projects plus projects considered in MTC's 2000 *Transportation Blueprint for the 21st Century* for which a funding source has not yet been identified. Many of these projects are being considered in other ongoing planning studies, including expanded ferry service, a California High Speed Rail system, and other long-term highway and transit improvements. Since this alternative includes all of the Blueprint 1 projects, it represents the most extensive set of transportation projects that could be funded under the most optimistic assumptions about future revenues.

LEVEL OF ANALYSIS

This EIR focuses primarily on regional impacts, but also addresses transportation corridor impacts for a number of the environmental impact areas. This approach reflects the organization of the 2001 RTP which presents information and transportation investments in a corridor format. MTC has defined 15 multi-modal travel corridors in the 2001 RTP in recognition of their primacy as determiners of regional travel patterns. As a program level EIR, individual project impacts are not addressed unless they are found to be regionally significant.

CUMULATIVE IMPACT ASSUMPTIONS

The term "cumulative impact", as defined in the CEQA Guidelines (§15355), "refers to two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts." This EIR distinguishes between the impacts of the 2001 RTP investment program as a whole and the independent impacts of forecast population and employment growth, which the projects and programs of the proposed 2001 RTP will serve. MTC assumes the regional growth estimates based upon the Association of Bay Area Governments' (ABAG) *Projections 2000*.¹ The impacts on the environment caused solely by the adoption and implementation of the 2001 RTP are not considered cumulative impacts in and of themselves. Additionally, some impacts on the environment are not under the influence of MTC and occur for reasons unrelated to its 2001 RTP investment.

¹ As part of the 2001 RTP planning effort, ABAG extended the forecasts in *Projections 2000* by an additional five years (from year 2020 to 2025) to correspond to the RTP horizon year of 2025.


2001 RTP BACKGROUND

With a population of nearly seven million in 2000, the San Francisco Bay Area is the fourth most populous metropolitan area in the United States behind Los Angeles, New York and Chicago. The region consists of nine counties: Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Solano, and Sonoma. There are a total of 4,436,500 acres in the region, and approximately 680,900 acres, or 15 percent, are developed. Seventy percent of this developed land is in residential use. The Bay Area transportation network includes, interstate and state freeways, county expressways, local streets and roads, bike paths, sidewalks, and a wide assortment of transit technologies, including heavy rail, light rail, intercity rail, buses, trolleys and ferries.

PROJECTED GROWTH


According to *ABAG Projections 2000*, the five most populated counties in the year 2000 in descending order were, Santa Clara, Alameda, Contra Costa, San Francisco and San Mateo, accounting for 82 percent of the region's population. ABAG projects that the Bay Area will add about 1.3 million new residents between 2000 and 2025. Population continues to grow much more quickly in suburban areas than urban areas as development expands outwards. Moreover, as a result of the shortage of affordable housing in the Bay Area, growth from the Bay Area is spilling over to outlying counties, such as San Benito, San Joaquin, Stanislaus, and Merced. Figure S-1 illustrates Bay Area growth.

Figure S-1: Population Growth by County (2000-2025)



With respect to employment, the top five counties for employment were in the year 2000 Santa Clara, Alameda, San Francisco, San Mateo, and Contra Costa, accounting for 86 percent of the Bay Area jobs. ABAG estimates that approximately 1.2 million new jobs will be created in the region between 2000 and 2025. The five most populous counties will also account for 84 percent of the region's jobs at the end of this period. While the top three counties will rank the same, Contra Costa County will surpass San Mateo in 2025. Bay Area employment trends are shown in Figure S-2.

Figure S-2: Employment Growth by County (2000-2025)



PROJECT IMPACTS

The analysis emphasizes the impacts of the 2001 RTP as a complete program, rather than as detailed analysis of the transportation improvements in the 2001 RTP. Individual improvements must still comply with the requirements of CEQA. Detailed analysis of the transportation improvements proposed in the 2001 RTP would be the responsibility of the agencies approving those projects. This EIR identifies three types of impacts:

- Short-term impacts;
- Long-term impacts; and
- Cumulative impacts.

In many instances the impacts outlined in this EIR do not so much result from the transportation improvements in the 2001 RTP as from the growth these projects are intended to serve. These are considered cumulative impacts. Table S-1 summarizes the significant impacts and recommended mitigation measures identified in this EIR. The impacts are organized by environmental impact area in the order in which they appear in Part Two.

ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

The CEQA Guidelines require each EIR to identify the environmentally superior alternative among the alternatives analyzed. If the No Project Alternative is identified as the environmentally superior alternative, then the EIR must identify another of the alternatives from among the alternatives analyzed. Since the No Project Alternative cannot be identified as the environmentally superior, this EIR identifies the Systems Management Alternative (Alternative 2) as environmentally superior. This alternative would result in fewer adverse environmental impacts because it would have less project development activity given the focus on maintenance and more efficient operations on the existing system. This alternative would also perform comparably to the No Project Alternative in several of the impact areas. However, Alternative 2 also adopts many of the strategies discussed in the 2001 RTP that are innovative and have not yet been developed sufficiently for widespread implementation (congestion pricing on the Bay bridges, use of reversible lanes, taking existing mixed flow lanes for carpools, and larger implementation of regional express bus services). Based on these conditions and the need to develop further consensus within the transportation community, public, and legislature for these types of strategies, this alternative is not yet ready for implementation. Further work is anticipated in all of these areas which will help determine their ultimate feasibility and public acceptability.

Table S-1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
Transportation		
2.1-1 Many transportation impacts show negative trends between 1998 and 2025 such as average travel time, auto accessibility to jobs, increases in VMT at LOS F, etc. (The one indicator that does show improvement is total jobs accessible by transit). These trends are the result of sustained population and economic growth that will occur in the region between 2000 and 2025 and the mismatch between travel demand and the supply of new capacity. However, in each of the impact areas evaluated the Project Alternative provides a significant improvement over the No Project Alternative. In addition, the Project provides further benefits that are not measured by funding shortfalls in pavement maintenance for local streets, capital rehabilitation needs of transit, and the costs of many ongoing regional programs directed at better system management and customer service.	There are no significant adverse effects on mobility due to implementation of the proposed 2001 RTP. The effects are all beneficial compared to the No Project Alternative.	Less than significant
Air Quality		
2.2-1 Emissions impacts for the Project Alternative for CO, ROG, and NO _x are not considered to be significant, since they are lower than today's emissions by substantial amounts.	None required.	Less than significant
2.2-2 PM ₁₀ emissions are projected to increase substantially due to projected regional growth and the attendant increase in travel. This is considered a cumulative impact.	The 2001 RTP reduces PM ₁₀ emissions relative to the No Project Alternative. Thus, implementation of the 2001 RTP is a measure to mitigate the environmental impact due to growth in PM ₁₀ since it includes programs and projects that can reduce the growth in VMT. Further, if a Federal PM ₁₀ attainment plan is required in the future, then MTC will identify appropriate control measures for PM ₁₀ emissions.	Less than significant
Energy		
2.3-1 There will be a cumulative impact in energy use resulting from growth in travel between 1998 and 2025.	The cumulative impact of increased transportation energy consumption and carbon dioxide (global warming emissions) could be mitigated by Congress adopting more stringent automobile fuel standards.	Significant

Table S-1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation

<i>Impact</i>		<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Significance After Mitigation</i>
Geology and Seismicity			
2.4-1	Seismic events could damage existing and proposed transportation infrastructure through surface rupture, ground shaking, liquefaction, landslides and tsunamis. Potential impacts to property and public safety from seismic activity would be considered significant.	MTC requires project sponsors to comply with CEQA and NEPA prior to project approval by MTC. The following mitigation measures shall be included in project-level analysis as appropriate for proposed new transportation improvements. The project proponent or local jurisdiction shall be responsible for ensuring adherence to the mitigation measures outlined below prior to construction: (refer to bulleted list of mitigation measures for this impact in Chapter 2.4).	Significant
2.4-2	Highway and rail construction could require significant earthwork and road cuts. Such projects could increase short-term and long-term soil erosion potential and slope failure.	Implementing agencies shall ensure that projects employ Best Management Practices to reduce soil erosion by water and wind. These could include temporary cover of exposed, engineered slopes, or silt fencing. All construction activities and design criteria shall comply with applicable codes and requirements of the 1997 Uniform Building Code with California additions (Title 22), and applicable Caltrans construction and grading ordinances. Implementing agencies shall also ensure that project designs provide adequate slope drainage and appropriate landscaping to minimize the occurrence of slope instability and erosion. Design features shall include measures to reduce erosion from stormwater. Road cuts shall be designed to maximize the potential for revegetation.	Less than significant
2.4-3	Projects built on highly compressible or expansive soils could become damaged and weakened over time.	Implementing agencies shall ensure that geotechnical investigations be conducted by qualified professionals (registered civil and geotechnical engineers, registered engineering geologists) to identify the potential for differential settlement and expansive soils. Recommended corrective measures, such as structural reinforcement and replacing soil with engineered fill, shall be incorporated into project designs.	Less than significant
2.4-4	The projected population increase in the Bay Area will result in increased travel on all modes of transportation. This would result in an increased risk of exposure of people and property to the potentially damaging effects of strong seismic shaking, fault rupture, seismically-induced ground failure and slope instability.	Since the cumulative impacts from the 2001 RTP are essentially the same as the direct and short-term impacts (exposing travelers to geologic hazards), the mitigation measures for this impact would be the same as for those outlined above.	Less than significant

Table S-1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Significance After Mitigation</i>
Biological Resources		
2.5-1 Transportation improvements in the 2001 RTP could adversely affect sensitive biological resources, including wetlands and aquatic resources.	Project sponsors shall demonstrate compliance with the provisions of CEQA and NEPA, as applicable, prior to project approval by the MTC. At the time of project certification, project sponsors shall agree to comply with mitigation measures to protect special-status plant and wildlife species. This requirement obligates project sponsors to implement measures that avoid, minimize, and compensate for significant impacts to special-status species and their habitat. In accordance with guidelines of the Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), and California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), a goal of “no net loss” of wetland acreage and value will be implemented, wherever possible, through avoidance of the resource. Mitigation for wetlands impacts due to proposed transportation projects would be based on project-specific wetland mitigation plans, subject to approval by the Corps and commenting agencies. Mitigation for placing fill in wetlands would be partially achieved by avoiding wetlands, and by minimizing fill where avoidance is not feasible.	Less than significant
2.5-2 Transportation improvements in the 2001 RTP could cause substantial disturbance of biologically unique or sensitive communities, including CDFG-recognized protected plant communities.	In accordance with guidelines of the Corps, EPA, USFWS, and CDFG, a goal of “no net loss” shall be achieved through avoidance of the resource, or through creation or restoration of habitat of superior or comparably quality. Where applicable, projects shall conform to the provisions of special area management or restoration plans such as the Suisun Marsh Protection Plan.	Less than significant
2.5-3 Proposed transportation improvements in the 2001 RTP could have deleterious impacts on special-status plant and wildlife species identified as endangered, candidate, and/or special status by the CDFG or USFWS, or on designated critical habitat for listed species.	Typical measures that may be included by project sponsors include: (refer to bulleted list of mitigation measures for this impact in Chapter 2.5).	Significant
2.5-4 Construction activities could adversely affect nonlisted nesting raptor species.	Typical measures that may be included by project sponsors include: (refer to bulleted list of mitigation measures for this impact in Chapter 2.5).	Less than significant
2.5-5 Construction activities could impact nonlisted nesting birds species protected under the federal	Typical measures that may be included by project sponsors include: (refer to bulleted list of mitigation measures for this impact in Chapter 2.5).	Less than significant

Table S-1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation

	<i>Impact</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Significance After Mitigation</i>
	Migratory Bird Treaty Act.		
2.5-6	Construction activities could cause mortality of common wildlife species.	No mitigation is required for this impact; however, the implementation of feasible mitigation measures for Impacts 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 above would further lessen this project impact.	Less than significant
2.5-7	Forecast urban development that would be served by transportation improvements in the 2001 RTP, combined with improved regional mobility provided by the 2001 RTP, could contribute to the conversion of undeveloped land to urban uses, resulting in the removal or fragmentation of habitat area.	As the cumulative impacts of the transportation improvements in the 2001 RTP are the same as the direct impacts listed above, the mitigation measures for this impact would also be the same.	Less than significant
Water Resources			
2.6-1	Construction of the proposed transportation improvements in the 2001 RTP could adversely affect water quality and drainage patterns in the short term due to erosion and sedimentation.	MTC shall require that project sponsors comply with CEQA (and NEPA if appropriate) prior to project approval by MTC. Project sponsors shall commit to mitigation measures at the time of certification of their project environmental document. These commitments obligate project sponsors to implement measures that would minimize or eliminate any significant impacts on water resources. Local permitting agencies shall require preparation and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The SWPPP shall be consistent with the State Construction Storm Water General Permit, the <i>Manual of Standards for Erosion and Sedimentation Control</i> by the Association of Bay Area Governments, policies and recommendations of the local urban runoff program (city and/or county), and the recommendations of the RWQCB. Implementation of the SWPPP shall be enforced by inspecting agencies during the construction period via appropriate options such as citations, fines, and stop-work orders.	Less than significant
2.6-2	The transportation improvements in the 2001 RTP could adversely affect water resources in the long term by reducing permeable surfaces, which could result in additional runoff and erosion, and decreased drainage area and groundwater recharge.	Typical mitigation measures that could be considered by project sponsors include: (refer to bulleted list of mitigation measures for this impact in Chapter 2.6).	Less than significant
2.6-3	Forecast urban development that would be served by transportation improvements in the	As the cumulative impacts of the transportation improvements in the 2001 RTP are the same as the direct impacts listed above, the mitigation	Less than significant

Table S-1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation

	<i>Impact</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Significance After Mitigation</i>
	2001 RTP, combined with new public and private infrastructure improvements to accommodate future planned urban development, could create higher erosion rates and reduced groundwater recharge.	measures for this impact would also be the same.	
Visual Resources			
2.7-1	Construction of certain transportation improvements in the 2001 RTP could significantly affect visual resources by adding or expanding transportation facilities in rural or open space areas, blocking views from adjoining areas, blocking or intruding into important vistas along roadways, and changing the scale, character, and quality of designated or eligible Scenic Highways.	MTC shall require that project sponsors comply with CEQA (and NEPA if appropriate) prior to project approval by MTC. Project sponsors shall commit to mitigation measures at the time of certification of their project environmental document. These commitments obligate project sponsors to implement measures that would minimize or eliminate any significant visual impacts. Typical mitigation measures that could be considered by project sponsors include: (refer to bulleted list of mitigation measures for this impact in Chapter 2.7).	Less than significant
2.7-2	The construction of soundwalls along freeways and arterials, where they are used to reduce noise levels in surrounding residential areas, could significantly alter views from the road reducing visual interest and sense of place while also limiting views and sunlight from adjoining areas.	Transportation project sponsors should consider the following mitigation measures to minimize significant visual impacts: (refer to bulleted list of mitigation measures for this impact in Chapter 2.7).	Significant
2.7-3	Forecast urban development that would be served by transportation improvements in the 2001 RTP could significantly change the visual character of many areas in the region, especially where development would occur on visually prominent hillsides or in existing rural or open space lands.	Local land use agencies are responsible for the approval of forecast urban development. These agencies should apply development standards and guidelines to maintain compatibility with surrounding natural areas, including site coverage, building height and massing, building materials and color, landscaping, site grading, etc., in visually sensitive sites areas.	Significant
Noise			
2.8-1	Construction of the transportation improvements proposed in the 2001 RTP would have short-term noise impacts on surrounding areas.	MTC shall require that project sponsors comply with CEQA (and NEPA if appropriate) prior to project approval by MTC. Project sponsors shall commit to mitigation measures at the time of certification of each environmental document and at the time of project approval. Construction noise mitigation normally required by Caltrans, as well as	Less than significant

Table S-1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Significance After Mitigation</i>
	local city and county ordinances. Construction mitigation measures generally limit construction activities to times when construction noise would have the least effect on adjacent land uses, and would require such measures as properly muffling equipment noise, and turning off equipment when not in use.	
2.8-2 Transportation improvements proposed as part of the 2001 RTP could result in noise levels that approach or exceed the FHWA and FTA Noise Abatement Criteria.	Noise mitigation measures must respond to local land use compatibility criteria, and, if federal funding is used for the project, mitigation measures must also conform to applicable FHWA or FTA noise abatement criteria. These commitments obligate project sponsors to implement measures that would minimize or eliminate any significant noise impacts. Typical mitigation measures that should be considered by project sponsors include: (refer to bulleted list of mitigation measures for this impact in Chapter 2.8). As noted, the implementation of noise mitigation will, in some cases, more than offset the noise impacts of a particular transportation improvement. As a result, the 2001 RTP has the potential to bring noise abatement benefits to communities that currently experience noise problems resulting from existing traffic.	Less than significant
2.8-3 Forecast urban development that would be served by transportation improvements in the 2001 RTP will result in increased traffic volumes along some transportation corridors in the Bay Area and could, in turn, increase noise levels along some of these corridors.	Except where project specific improvements create the need for noise mitigation, increased noise in other parts of the Bay Area would not necessarily be mitigated unless communities and local transportation authorities: 1) determine that a noise problem exists and that the problem is one of a perceptible nature, and 2) identify local or other transportation funds not currently included in the proposed RTP to provide the necessary mitigation. In many corridors the projected traffic increases are unlikely to produce perceptible increases in noise since there may not be any sensitive receptors nearby and the increased volumes would not trigger a significant impact.	Less than significant
Cultural Resources		
2.9-1 Individual transportation improvements in the 2001 RTP that involve ground disturbing activities have the potential to disturb, destroy, or significantly affect cultural resources.	MTC shall require that project sponsors comply with CEQA (and NEPA if appropriate) prior to project approval by MTC. Project sponsors shall commit to mitigation measures at the time of certification of their project environmental document. These commitments obligate project sponsors to implement measures that would minimize or eliminate any significant impacts on cultural resources. Typical mitigation measures that can be considered by project sponsors include: (refer to bulleted list of	Less than significant

Table S-1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation

<i>Impact</i>		<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Significance After Mitigation</i>
		mitigation measures for this impact in Chapter 2.9).	
2.9-2	Forecast urban development that would be served by transportation improvements in the 2001 RTP could, when it occurs, have the potential to disturb, destroy, or significantly affect cultural resources.	Local land use agencies are responsible for the approval of forecast urban development and for determining appropriate mitigation during their CEQA processes. In addition, local historic preservation regulations, where they exist, would apply to such development.	Significant
Population, Housing, and Social Environment			
2.10-1	Right-of-way acquisition associated with transportation improvements in the 2001 RTP could result in residential and business displacement or relocation.	MTC shall require that project sponsors comply with CEQA (and NEPA if appropriate) prior to project approval by MTC. Project sponsors shall commit to mitigation measures at the time of certification of their project environmental document. Mitigation measures will be identified to the extent feasible to minimize impacts. These commitments obligate project sponsors to implement measures that would minimize or eliminate any significant community displacement effects. Mitigation for displacement effects involves the preparation and execution of relocation assistance plans that typically consider: (refer to bulleted list of mitigation measures for this impact in Chapter 2.10).	Less than significant
2.10-2	Transportation improvements in the 2001 RTP have the potential to disrupt or divide a community by separating community facilities, restricting community access to the region, or eliminating community amenities.	Mitigation measures will be identified to the extent feasible to minimize impacts. Additionally, MTC can encourage project sponsors through EIR comments to consider design elements in their projects that would maintain or enhance neighborhood accessibility.	Less than significant
2.10-3	Construction of transportation improvements in the 2001 RTP could significantly disrupt adjoining communities in the short term.	Typical mitigation measures that could be considered by project sponsors include: (refer to bulleted list of mitigation measures for this impact in Chapter 2.10).	Significant
Land Use			
2.11-1	Construction of certain transportation improvements in the 2001 RTP, such as the expansion of existing facilities and the construction of new facilities, could convert resource lands, including prime agricultural lands designated by the State of California and parks and open space lands in public ownership or control, to transportation uses.	MTC shall require that project sponsors comply with CEQA (and NEPA if appropriate) prior to project approval by MTC. Project sponsors shall commit to mitigation measures at the time of certification of their project environmental document. These commitments obligate project sponsors to implement measures that would minimize or eliminate any significant impacts resulting in the conversion of resource lands. Typical mitigation measures that could be considered by project sponsors include: (refer to bulleted list of mitigation measures for this impact in Chapter 2.11).	Significant

Table S-1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation

	<i>Impact</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Significance After Mitigation</i>
2.11-2	Concurrent implementation of the proposed 2001 RTP and forecast development of residential and employment land uses in the Bay Area over the next 25 years would result in a significant expansion of urban areas and significant changes in land use and the character of neighborhoods and districts in the Bay Area.	While MTC has no land use authority and cannot directly affect the pattern that future land uses will take, it can continue to participate in and promote the efforts of the Regional Agencies Smart Growth Initiative which is intended to coordinate regional smart growth efforts to use land more efficiently, optimize transportation and other infrastructure investments, preserve open space, etc. In this way, MTC can pursue the enhanced coordination of local land use plans and investments in the 2001 RTP.	Less than significant
2.11-3	The amount and location of new development can have locally significant effects on transportation demand, and on the location and amount of congestion.	While the secondary impacts of local land use decisions on the transportation system in the Bay Area are potentially significant, the mitigation associated with Impact 2.11-2 above could lead to the enhanced coordination of local land use plans and investments in the 2001 RTP. MTC also supports better integration of transportation and land use through its Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) program and Housing Incentive Program (HIP).	Significant

